

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 19 are pending in this application, claims 1 to 19 having been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(a) as being indefinite due to errors of indefiniteness, double inclusions, elements lacking antecedent basis, and typographical errors. Applicant's representative notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 1, 6 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and that claims 2 to 5, 7 to 12 and 14 to 19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The Examiner additionally presented suggested amendments to claim 1. The Applicant's representative has amended claim 1 to incorporate the Examiner's suggested changes to claim 1. Independent 6 and 13 have been amended to correct 35 U.S.C. §112 errors in a manner consistent with the Examiner's suggested amendments to claim 1. Dependent claims 2 to 5, 7 to 12 and 14 to 19 have also been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Dependent claims 2 to 5, 7 to 12 and 14 include the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

The Examiner cited claims 1, 6 and 13 as being indefinite and vague for failing to define which groove is extended across the roll mantle. Claims 1, 6 and 13 now clearly recite that both the spiral-shaped groove pattern and the plurality of guide grooves extend along at least a portion of the width of the roll mantle. Claim 2 was cited as being redundant with respect to claim 1. Applicant's representative respectfully suggests that claim 2, which claims a first winding drum and a second winding drum arrangement, clearly defines over claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 is not redundant because it further limits the scope of claim 1, from which it depends. Claim 2 was also cited as being replete with double inclusions. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to remove the double inclusion of the patterned mantle limitation.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that all claims presented in this application are currently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant's representative respectfully requests favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.


Appl. No. 09/673,981  
Amdt. Dated May 10, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2004

990.1240

Applicant's representative believes that this response is being filed in a timely manner. In the event that any extension and/or fee is required for the entry of this amendment the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
~~STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.~~

By:   
Martin G. Raskin  
Reg. No. 25,642

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.  
1140 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 768-3800